

Application No.: 10/502,106

Case No.: 57213US004

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-19 are pending. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of claims 1-19 in view of the following remarks.

**1. Claims 1-19 are Novel and Not Obvious in view of Fujii et al., Matsuzawa et al., Akahori et al.**

**a. Fujii et al. (U.S. Pat. Nos. 6,165,061 and 6,398,826)**

Claims 1-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as allegedly being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Fujii et al. (U.S. Pat. Nos. 6,165,061 and 6,398,826). Applicants request reconsideration of this rejection because Fujii et al. do not teach or suggest the use of a lubricating liquid that "is an aqueous solution containing a hydrophilic surfactant", as recited in Applicants' claims.

Fujii et al. report an abrasive tape suitable for finishing surfaces such as optical connector ferrules. Fujii et al. report that a lubricant can be used "such as water, alcohol, a surfactant, oil, or the like" to improve workability and handling. ('061 at col. 9, lines 37-43; '826 at col. 9, lines 38-43). Fujii et al., however, do not teach or suggest the use of an aqueous solution containing a hydrophilic surfactant. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1-19 in view of Fujii et al. should be withdrawn.

**b. Matsuzawa et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,615,499)**

Claims 1-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as allegedly being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Matsuzawa et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,615,499). Applicants request reconsideration of this rejection because Matsuzawa et al. do not teach or suggest the use of an "abrasive film composed of abrasive grains fixed on a film-form substrate", as recited in Applicants' claims.

Matsuzawa et al. report a method for producing cerium oxide that can be used as an abrasive. Matsuzawa et al. report that the abrasive preferably contains a slurry in which cerium

Application No.: 10/502,106

Case No.: 57213US004

oxide particles are dispersed (see, e.g., col. 3, lines 40-46). Matsuzawa et al. do not teach or suggest the use of an "abrasive film composed of abrasive grains fixed on a film-form substrate", as recited in Applicants' claims. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1-19 in view of Matsuzawa et al. should be withdrawn.

**c. Akahori et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,783,434)**

Claims 1-19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as allegedly being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Akahori et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,783,434). Applicants request reconsideration of this rejection because Akahori et al. do not teach or suggest the use of an "abrasive film composed of abrasive grains fixed on a film-form substrate", as recited in Applicants' claims.

Akahori et al. report a method for polishing substrates that includes the use of a cerium oxide slurry (see, e.g., col. 2, lines 39-45). Akahori et al. do not teach or suggest the use of an "abrasive film composed of abrasive grains fixed on a film-form substrate", as recited in Applicants' claims. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1-19 in view of Akahori et al. should be withdrawn.

**II. Conclusion**

In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is requested. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative with any questions concerning Applicant's application.

Respectfully submitted,

October 21, 2005

Date

By: 

Daniel D. Biesterveld, Reg. No.: 45,898

Telephone No.: 651-737-3193

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel  
3M Innovative Properties Company  
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833